



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/853,526	08/27/2001	Daniel Cohen	GEN-T111XC3D1	7147	
7590 05/02/2005			EXAMINER		
Frank C. Eisenchenk, Ph.D.			YAEN, CHRIS	YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H	
Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik			ADTIDUT	DARED MAINER	
Suite A-1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2421 N.W. 41st Street			1642		
Gainesville, FL 32606-6669			DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/853,526	COHEN ET AL.	COHEN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Christopher H. Yaen	1642			

before the filling of all Appear biles	Examiner	Art Unit	İ			
	Christopher H. Yaen	1642				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr nally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 19 November 2004. A of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl)), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	R 41.37(e)), to avoid	dismissal of the			
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 50-65.		l be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ied.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but Applicant's arguments are insufficient to overcome the reapplicant has not specifically defined a specific or substate to detect or diagnose neoplastic disease is unpersuasive between a neopalstic diease and the detection of the ison description is also maintained because the specification sufficient representative species to represent the genus	ejection under 35 USC 101 and 11: antial utilty. The applicant's argume be because the specification as filed oforms. In addition, the rejection of has not provided sufficient structure	2, 1 st enablementbeca etns concerning the u has not established claims under 35 USC	ause the use of isoforms a clear nexus C 112, 1 st written			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:	habu	~(·)				
791	11-0000					

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
4/21/05

Christopher Yaen Art Unit 1642 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 4272005